

Correlates of Authoritarianism and Nationalism

An Honors Thesis (PSYS/HONR 499)

by

Rose M. Skelly

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Johnathan Forbey

**Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana**

May 2018

Expected Date of Graduation

May 2018

Sp Coll
Undergrad
Thesis
LD
2489
.24
2018
.5598

Abstract

This study will examine psychological correlates of Nationalism and Authoritarianism. People with Authoritarian personalities typically have traits such as adherence to conventional values, submission to authority, and a belief that those who do not follow the same conventional rules as they do should be punished (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). Nationalists also believe in following conventions, that strong authority is necessary to control human nature, and that those who do not follow the established rules should be punished (Forbes, 1985). Researchers have studied correlations of Authoritarianism and psychopathology (Van Hiel, Mervielde, and De Fruyt, 2002; Laguna, Linn, Ward, and Rupslaukyte, 2009); however, there has been relatively little research on the associations between Nationalism and psychopathology. This study will use archival data from 805 Ball State University students between the ages of 18 and 48 to fill the gap in this literature. Because of the common characteristics of Nationalism and Authoritarianism, it is predicted that there will be significant correlations between scores on a scale of Nationalism and scales of the MMPI-2-RF typically associated with Authoritarianism.

Keywords: Authoritarianism, Nationalism, psychopathology

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Johnathan Forbey for acting as my advisor for this thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Thomas Holtgraves for his help each week in our departmental honors class, and my classmates for their suggestions and support.

Process Analysis Statement

I was given the opportunity to combine the Psychological Science Department's senior capstone requirement and my Honors College thesis requirement into one project. In doing so, I became eligible to receive departmental honors from the Psychological Science Department. For this project, I was required to perform my own research project and present my findings in a public forum. My thesis process started about a year ago at the end of the spring semester in 2017. The departmental honors class is distributed across two semesters, which meant I had to confirm my advisor before the end of that spring semester and enroll in the course before the start of the fall semester. I asked Dr. Forbey to be my advisor, and I am thankful he agreed to oversee my thesis.

I used archival data at Dr. Forbey's suggestion, as he told me it would be hard to get enough participants to have significant results if I did my own data collection. He has conducted many large-scale research projects at Ball State over the years and had a data set he suggested I use. It had plenty of participants and had all of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2-Restructured Form scales and a scale assessing Nationalism. When he wrote up those particular results back in 2010, he and his research team did not end up using the Nationalism scale. He had always wanted to investigate the scale, and suggested I use it in my study. I had never studied political psychology before but was up to the challenge. Dr. Forbey and I agreed that the results would be interesting given the current political climate in the United States and the world.

During the fall semester of 2017, my departmental honors classmates and I met once a week to discuss our progress on our theses. This time was spent doing research and coming up with possible hypotheses, as well as working on the literature review. While I knew that I would

be studying Nationalism in some way, I still had to decide what my hypothesis would be and what sort of project I could do with the measures I had available. My departmental honors teacher, Dr. Thomas Holtgraves, suggested that I look into how Nationalism relates to Authoritarianism. I began to look into research on Authoritarianism and continued my studies in Nationalism. As I continued to do research, I saw that there were similarities between the two. One of the hard parts of doing research on Nationalism and Authoritarianism is that there is a divide between general political science-oriented research and psychological research. Many times, the political research did not mention the psychological characteristics of Nationalism or Authoritarianism, and vice-versa. One of the challenges was blending these two separate categories into my thesis. However, there was no lack of research about either Nationalism or Authoritarianism. For instance, I used research by Adorno and his colleagues, who studied Authoritarianism in the aftermath of World War II and the crimes committed by the Nazis. Many American researchers also studied the concepts of Nationalism and Patriotism after 9/11, as pro-U.S. sentiment surged. I had plenty of research that supported the idea that Nationalism and Authoritarianism had characteristics in common and were similar in several ways.

As I only had the MMPI-2-RF scales and the Nationalism Scale, I was somewhat limited in what I could use for my project. However, there are 51 scales of the MMPI-2-RF, so I realized that at least some of them should relate to Authoritarianism. In my studies on Authoritarianism, several characteristics stood out as good examples of the construct. Authoritarians are often aggressive, angry, paranoid, and cynical; therefore, I decided to use the corresponding scales of Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution, and Cynicism of the MMPI-2-RF as my measures of Authoritarianism. Once I settled on these scales, I began constructing my literature review and running the analyses of Dr. Forbey's archival data this semester. Analyzing the data

was not too difficult, as I have taken two statistics courses through the psychology department. Any questions I had about the analyses were easily answered by Dr. Holtgraves or Dr. Forbey. I conducted Pearson's correlation coefficient between participants' scores on a scale measuring Nationalism and their scores on the four scales of the MMPI-2-RF I had selected as measures of Authoritarianism.

One of the requirements for the departmental honors degree was that I present my research findings at a conference or forum of some sort. Many of my classmates had previously attended Butler University's Undergraduate Research Conference in the past and had good things to say about it. I decided that I would present a poster there. It was my first time presenting any sort of research, and the first presentation that I had done outside of a classroom at Ball State. I was a little nervous, but once a few people asked me about my project I realized just how passionate I was about my thesis. I am glad that the presentation was a requirement as I became more confident in my thesis and had the opportunity to talk about it with people who had not heard about it before.

This thesis is the first research project I have ever done. It was an intimidating project to undertake because of this, but I had a lot of support and advice from Dr. Holtgraves and my classmates in departmental honors, as well as my advisor Dr. Forbey. I am very glad I decided to do this project, as I intend to go to graduate school in psychology in a year and will be doing similar projects and papers. I was somewhat out of my comfort zone undertaking a project on political psychology, a field I had never given much thought to before, but ultimately, I am happy with my thesis choice. It is important to expand one's knowledge, and I did just that through this thesis.

Correlates of Authoritarianism and Nationalism

Obedience to authority and love of country are considered positive traits in a citizen. Those who value their country and remain devoted to it are looked on with favor and upheld as examples. But when those traits evolve into their extreme versions - Authoritarianism and Nationalism - there can be negative effects on a person's life and their views of the world, which could in turn lead to ostracizing or harming dissimilar others. Authoritarianism was especially researched in the aftermath of World War II. Psychologists and citizens alike were horrified by the atrocities committed by Nazi soldiers in the name of obedience and wanted to investigate the reasons why people obey authority figures. Nationalism, on the other hand, has been a concept in political science in Europe for centuries. Nationalism can be generally defined as the belief that one's country is superior to all other countries. There can be subcategories of Nationalism, such as the belief that one's ethnic or cultural identity is superior to others. While Authoritarianism and Nationalism appear to be different concepts at their face values, they do have things in common. Some of these characteristics include an adherence to conventional values, the belief that those who do not follow conventional values should be punished in some way, and a respect and desire for an authority figure.

The purpose of this research was to undertake analyses examining the psychological correlates of Nationalism related to Authoritarianism. Because Authoritarianism and Nationalism have overlapping characteristics, I predicted there would be a relationship between scores on a scale of Nationalism and scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form that are associated with Authoritarianism.

Authoritarianism

As the crimes committed in World War II came to light, many researchers questioned what allowed these horrors to happen. A group of psychologists published "The Authoritarian Personality" (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) to get to the root of what made people susceptible to fascism. They came up with the F-scale to measure how Authoritarian a person was. The characteristics that made up the scale were: *conventionalism*, which is adherence to conventional or middle-class values; *authoritarian submission*, or submission to an established authority; *authoritarian aggression*, which punishes anyone who violates conventional values; *anti-intraception*, opposing subjectivity and imagination; *superstition and stereotypy*, the belief that one's fate is determined by destiny and thinking in rigid categories; *power and toughness*, a preoccupation with being powerful and an overemphasis on strength; *destructiveness and cynicism*, a hostility toward humanity; *projectivity*, projecting one's emotions and the belief that the world is dangerous; and *sex*, an exaggerated preoccupation with sexual activity. These variables combine to make up someone with an Authoritarian personality (Adorno et al., 1950). Altemeyer (1981) made his own measure of Authorities with the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale. People who scored high on this scale are prejudiced, are hostile toward minorities, and are aggressive, as well as submissive to established authorities (Altemeyer, 2004).

Several researchers have examined the link between Authoritarianism and psychopathology and have reported significant relationships, while others have been inconclusive. Van Hiel, Mervielde, and De Fruyt (2004) found significant positive correlations between right-wing ideology and Compulsiveness and Disagreeableness, along with negative correlations with scores on Openness to Experience on the Dimensional Assessment of

Personality Pathology-Basic Questionnaire (Livesley, 1990). The participants were recruited as part of a larger study in which participants were two adolescents and one adult from the same family. This study was ultimately inconclusive; researchers were unable to find any indicators of psychopathology and maladaptive personality correlated with the right-wing authoritarian scale. Laguna, Linn, Ward, and Rupslaukyte (2009) examined Authoritarianism and psychopathology in experienced and inexperienced police officers. Cynicism, Anger and Antisocial Practices scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI-2) were selected as indicators of Authoritarianism. In this study, no officer was found to have any psychopathological functioning. However, this could be explained by the requirement that police officers are required to undergo psychiatric evaluations prior to being hired. In addition, researchers also studied officers' scores on Hysteria, Psychopathic Deviance, and Mania. Initially researchers hypothesized that experienced officers would be more Authoritarian than inexperienced officers due to their extended experience and development of certain traits and necessary skills. However, the only significant differences between experienced and inexperienced officers were scores on the Antisocial Practices scale and Hysteria scale. Experienced officers scored significantly higher on the Hysteria scale while inexperienced officers scored higher on the Antisocial Practices scale. A limitation of this study is that there was not a control group to compare police officers to; in studying how Authoritarian police officers are, it would be beneficial to show how they compare to civilians on a measure of Authoritarianism. However, this study proved helpful in establishing which MMPI-2 scales could be used to measure Authoritarianism.

Aggression. People who have higher levels of Authoritarianism tend to score higher in levels of aggression. Raden (1981) tested 245 university students for a relationship between

scores on a 5-item measure of Authoritarianism and measurements of prejudice, tolerance of deviation, attitude toward the Vietnam War, attitude toward treatment of criminals, and attitude toward welfare programs. Using factor analysis, he found a relationship between the Authoritarianism scale and the measure examining attitudes toward treatment of prisoners, along with prejudice, tolerance of deviation, support for the Vietnam War, and perception of crime (Raden, 1981). These results indicated a common theme of negative attitudes toward those who are different: people higher in Authoritarianism supported the Vietnam War more and had negative attitudes toward minority group members, criminals, and political deviants. Overall, Raden determined a disposition of aggression in those with Authoritarian personalities (Raden, 1981). Benjamin (2006) conducted a simple study looking for a relationship between scores on the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale and the Attitudes Toward Violence Scale (Anderson, Benjamin, Wood, & Bonacci, 2006). The ATVS measures attitudes toward war, penal code violence, corporal punishment, and intimate violence. These factors have a positive relationship with Aggressiveness measured by an Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992). The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale measures submission to authority, conventionalism, and a readiness to engage in aggression authorized by authority figures. Benjamin surveyed 150 university students, finding that all four Attitudes Toward Violence Scale subscales were significantly related to attitudes toward war, penal code violence, and corporal punishment on the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale. There was not a significant relationship between the Attitudes Toward Violence Scale and attitudes toward intimate violence. Based on the results of this study, people who score higher in Authoritarianism as measured by the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale also score higher in attitudes toward violence and aggression.

Anger Proneness. People who are high in Authoritarianism may be more prone to anger, especially when perceiving what they assume to be violations against authority figures. Saeri, Iyer, and Louis (2015) examined scores on the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale and the Social Dominance Orientation, which measures acceptance of hierarchy based on groups, with some groups being more advantaged than others. The researchers wanted to see how those scores related to willingness to take action to support either party in an external conflict. In the first study, 162 United States residents were measured with the Social Dominance Orientation scale and the Right Wing Authoritarianism scale. They read two synopses of conflict, one taking place in Greece and one in Russia, in which the governments were the advantaged groups and the protesting citizens were disadvantaged. Researchers also measured the participants' willingness to take action to support either the government or the citizens, their identification with each group, and their feelings of anger toward each group. Both SDO and RWA were associated with more identification with the government and anger toward the protestors, which then predicted actions to support the government (Saeri, Iyer, & Louis, 2015). In the second study, 154 participants were measured with the same assessments as the first study (except for a longer RWA scale) and read about a conflict between the government and citizens in a fictional country. Again, SDO and RWA scores predicted identification with the advantaged government and anger at the disadvantaged citizens, as well as the decision to support the government (Saeri, Iyer, & Louis, 2015). In both studies, not only were participants high in Authoritarianism more likely to support the perceived rightful authority – the government in the simulation – but they were also inclined to feel anger toward the group in the wrong, the protestors.

Ideas of Persecution Koller (1995) hypothesized that people who were high in Authoritarianism would react more to unfair accusations, because of their valuation of social

norms and their belief in consequences for these behaviors. He had participants take Adorno's F-scale and then read a rebuttal from a person warning people to stop spreading rumors about him. Participants were asked to guess what the person's motivations for the rebuttal were. They were separated into three groups: one reflected on a time when a rumor turned out to be true, one recalled when they were accused of something that was not true, and the third did not have a priming procedure. Koller found that people higher in Authoritarianism attributed the rebuttal to feelings of anxiety, guilt, and paranoia (Koller, 1995). In a longitudinal study, Mirisola, Roccato, Russo, Spagna, and Vieno (2013) measured changes in Authoritarianism among people who felt threatened. Researchers used archival data collected over a period of three years, in which 1,169 participants' scores on Right Wing Authoritarianism and perceived societal threat to safety were measured. People originally both low and high in Authoritarianism increased their Authoritarianism scores as perceived threat increased. However, the increase for those originally low in Authoritarianism was more significant (Mirisola et al., 2013). The more threat a person felt, the more likely they were to increase in Authoritarianism.

Cynicism. A characteristic Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) considered an aspect of the Authoritarian personality is cynicism. Pattyn, Van Hiel, Dhont, and Onraet (2011) examined the relationship between Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, and political cynicism, which is seen as a belief that politicians only care about themselves and their own power. They found that scores on the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 1981) were positively correlated with both political cynicism and social cynicism (Pattyn et al., 2011). People who are more Authoritarian are more likely to question the motives of not only society at large, but politicians as well. Napier and Jost (2008) used cynicism, along with conventionalism, moral absolutism, and obedience to authority, as

indicators of Authoritarianism when testing for ethnic and moral intolerance. They found that all four Authoritarianism characteristics predicted ethnic and moral intolerance. Farmer (1977) hypothesized that as correctional officers are in naturally Authoritarian roles, they would have elevated levels of cynicism. Correctional officers are in charge of maintaining order in prisons and jails and must enforce rules and laws. Officers from three different facilities were surveyed; all indicated high levels of cynicism (Farmer, 1977). The third facility, which focused on rehabilitation, had almost twice the number of cynics as the other two facilities, which were more traditional prisons. The researchers speculated that this may be because the officers were required to control the prisoners and maintain order while helping the therapeutic progress of the prisoner (Farmer, 1977). Cynicism in this case may be a defense mechanism for the officers.

Nationalism

The concept of Nationalism has existed for some time. In Europe, the idea began to originate in the 16th and 17th centuries, and especially surged after the French Revolution (Smith, 2005). Van Evera (1994) conceptualized Nationalism as a movement in which members give their primary loyalty to their national community, which supersedes loyalty to all other groups. Nationalists tend to be suspicious of foreigners and people who do not belong to their country. They believe that those who do not follow rules and conventional values should be punished, and that strong authority is needed to control human nature. Authority is very important to Nationalists, and they admire strong leaders and feel a need to follow them. Along with this is the belief that following rules and conventions are important (Forbes, 1985). Loyalty is also important to Nationalists, specifically to their self-identified group - as citizens of a certain country or as members of a certain ethnicity or culture (Kecmanovic, 1996). Because of Nationalists' strong views about the superiority of their own nation, they tend to be wary of

immigrants and hold anti-immigrant beliefs (Pehrson, Vignoles & Brown, 2009). They may also be xenophobic, not just intolerant but afraid of people who are different than they are.

Nationalism v. Patriotism

Because Nationalism can be described as the belief that one's nation is superior to all others, it is often confused with Patriotism, which can be thought of as love of country. Forbes (1985) outlined the difference between a true patriot and what Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) called a "pseudopatriot" (Forbes, 1985, p. 57). Patriots love their countries but are also able to appreciate other countries and cultures. Patriots do not want their country to dominate the entire world and identify more with humanity at large than just as citizens of a particular country. On the other hand, pseudopatriots – or Nationalists – value their countries' customs and cultures at the expense of other countries (Forbes, 1985). In their studies on Authoritarianism, Adorno et al. (1950) examined ethnocentrism, or prejudice against others. They included a subscale on their Ethnocentrism Scale assessing Patriotism. However, this was not true Patriotism, the authors pointed out; instead, in this context Patriotism indicated convention to cultural values, conformity with group ways and actions, and rejection of other nations. Patriots in this sense value their in-groups, regard other nations as inferior and as threats, and want their nation to be dominant (Adorno et al., 1950). Kosterman & Feshbach (1989) measured American participants' scores on a Patriotism/Nationalism scale, which included six subscales: Patriotism, Nationalism, Internationalism, Civil Liberties, World Government, and Smugness. The Patriotism subscale measured one's attachment to one's nation - "the degree of love for and pride in one's nation" (Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989, p. 271). The Nationalism subscale showed participants' belief in national superiority and their orientation toward national dominance. They correlated participants' scores on the Patriotism/Nationalism

scale with a Nuclear Policy Questionnaire, which assessed their attitudes toward the Soviet Union, negative attitudes toward people who support a nuclear freeze, and to the survivability of a nuclear war. Nationalism was more strongly correlated with the Nuclear Policy Questionnaire as a whole, and was positively correlated with each of the three subscales. Patriotism was only negatively correlated with negative attitudes toward those who support a nuclear freeze. These findings suggest that there is indeed a difference between the two.

Nationalism and Authoritarianism

Nationalism and Authoritarianism are different constructs. Authoritarianism implies a belief in the importance of authority figures, while Nationalism can be generalized as the belief that one's country is superior to other countries. However, the two constructs also have similar characteristics, such as adherence to conventional values, submission to authority, and a belief that those who do not follow the same conventional rules as they do should be punished (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Forbes, 1985). Past research has shown that there is a relationship between Authoritarianism and Nationalism. Osborn, Milojev, and Sibley (2017) assessed participants in New Zealand and found that participants' scores on a shortened version of the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale were positively correlated with scores on measures of Nationalism and Patriotism. Additionally, the effect on Nationalism was three times the size of the effect of the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale on Patriotism (Osborne et al., 2017). Nationalism and Patriotism were assessed using two questions each from Kosterman and Feshbach's (1989) scales.

One of the most important similarities between Nationalism and Authoritarianism is that Nationalists value the main belief of Authoritarianism: that authority figures are important and must be obeyed. For Authoritarians, this is shown through obedience and devotion to specified

authority figures. Shulman and Bloom (2014) empirically tested the link between Nationalism and citizens' loyalty. They examined national identity, sentiment, unity, and autonomy as dimensions of nationhood, and respect for law, unconditional support for country, and willingness to fight for country as types of citizen loyalty. They found positive relationships between national identity and national sentiment and general respect for law; attachment to country, pride, and chauvinism were correlated with unconditional support for country; and pride and national autonomy were associated with a willingness to fight for one's country (Shulman & Bloom, 2014). These results were moderate, the authors pointed out, but still allude to a relationship between Nationalism and citizen loyalty – or, obedience to authority.

Another important aspect of both Authoritarianism and Nationalism is the high value of in-groups. People high in these characteristics value those who are like them. Bonikowski and DiMaggio (2016) used survey data from 2004 to assess different characteristics of Nationalism. They found that many respondents to the survey indicated the importance of being a “true American,” possessing citizenship, speaking English, and respecting America's laws and institutions. The overwhelming majority of respondents endorsed statements describing America as better than most other countries and indicated they would rather be a citizen of the United States than any other country (80 % and 90% of respondents, respectively). The researchers found that “ardent Nationalists” – those who scored highest on the measures of Nationalism, making up 24% of all respondents– were more likely to believe that having citizenship, being able to speak English, feeling American, living in America most of one's life, and respecting America's laws and institutions were “very important” for someone to be a true American (Bonikowski & DiMaggio, 2016). Of these ardent Nationalists, 86% believed being born in America and 75% believed being a Christian were important aspects of a true American. People

who are high in Nationalism value those like them and their in-group; in America, that means speaking English, being a citizen, respecting the laws, and being a Christian. The importance of in-groups is a distinct factor in Authoritarianism as well. Van IJzendoorn (1989) examined the relationship between Authoritarianism and ethnocentrism. In separate studies examining high school and college students, he found a significant relationship between Authoritarianism and ethnocentrism (van IJzendoorn, 1989). The more Authoritarian participants were, the more likely they were to be ethnocentric, implying a prejudice towards those not like them.

Current research

Authoritarianism and Nationalism have several characteristics in common, including an adherence to traditional or conservative values, the belief that those who do not follow these values should be punished, and a respect for authority and a desire for an authority figure. Because of the characteristics the two concepts have in common, it can be assumed that they are associated or overlap in some way. Prior research has shown an association between the two when directly measured (Osborn, Milojev, and Sibley, 2017); however, this study used a shortened version of an assessment for Nationalism.

I examined correlations between participants' scores on the Nationalism Scale and subscales on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) that are associated with or related to Authoritarianism. The scales used were: Aggression - Authoritarians tend to be aggressive towards people who disagree with them; Anger Proneness, that those who disagree should be punished; Ideas of Persecution, which relates to the belief that those who are different pose a danger; and Cynicism, which relates to the Authoritarian belief that humanity is inherently bad. Because of the shared traits, I hypothesized that scores on

nationalism would be positively correlated with Authoritarianism-related scores on the MMPI-2-RF.

Method

Participants

This study was conducted using archival data from college students collected for an article published in 2010. The data was collected on Ball State University's campus from 805 students between the ages of 18 and 48 in one computerized session. Students received class credit for their participation.

Materials

The two assessments used in the original study were the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form and a Nationalism Scale. The MMPI-2 RF measures personality and psychopathology (Ben-Porath & Tellegen, 2011). The other scale used was the Nationalism Scale, a 17-point measure used to assess participants' levels of Nationalism (Todosijević, 2001).

Procedure

A one-way analysis of variance was performed comparing scores on the Nationalism Scales of the Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution, and Cynicism scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form.

Results

Preliminary Results

Data was collected on Ball State University's campus from 846 college students. Participants were excluded if there was evidence that their MMPI-2 RF scores were invalid. Participants who had a Cannot Say Raw-r (CNS-r) score greater than or equal to 18 and/or a

True Response Inconsistency (TRIN-r) or Variable Response Inconsistency (VRIN-r) greater than or equal to 80 were excluded from the analysis. A total of 41 participants were excluded from this study as a result. The final sample consisted of 805 students, whose ranged in age from 18 to 48 ($M=19.20$, $SD=2.531$). There were 244 men who participated in the study and 561 women. Of the revised sample, 738 participants were white, 40 were African American, and 27 were Other/Not Identified. Descriptive statistics for participants' scores on the five measures can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for measurement instruments.

	Minimum score	Maximum score	Mean	Standard deviation
Nationalism Scale	17.00	98.00	63.54	12.43
Aggression	37.00	92.00	50.72	11.70
Anger Proneness	39.00	80.00	51.92	11.05
Ideas of Persecution	43.00	100.00	55.66	11.07
Cynicism	34.00	83.00	55.46	9.54

Hypothesis testing

I hypothesized that people who had higher scores on a scale measuring Nationalism would have higher scores on scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form that are associated with Authoritarianism. Participants took the Nationalism Scale (Todosijević, 2001), containing 17 statements ($\alpha = .87$). They indicated whether they

agreed or disagreed with the statement using a 6-point Likert scale, with lower numbers showing more agreement with the statement and higher number indicating less agreement. Thus, a person who scored lower on this scale was considered a higher level of Nationalism. Participants in this study also took the MMPI-2 RF, which measures personality and psychopathology.

To investigate the relationship between scores on a scale of Nationalism and scores on the MMPI-2 RF scales Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution, and Cynicism. Pearson's correlations coefficient was computed. The results were significant for each scale measured: Aggression, ($r = -.129, p < .001, r^2 = .017$), Anger Proneness, ($r = -.129, p < .001, r^2 = .017$), Ideas of Persecution, ($r = -.135, p < .001, r^2 = .018$), and Cynicism, ($r = -.194, p < .001, r^2 = .038$).

Table 2

Relationships between Nationalism and selected MMPI-2RF scales.

	Nationalism and Aggression	Nationalism and Anger Proneness	Nationalism and Ideas of Persecution	Nationalism and Cynicism
Correlation	-.129	-.129	-.135	-.194
Sig.	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001
N	805	805	805	805

The hypothesis was supported. People who scored lower on the Nationalism scale scored higher on the Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution, and Cynicism scales. Based on the scoring of the Nationalism Scale, people who were higher in Nationalism also scored high on these four scales.

Exploratory Analyses

Some interesting results occur when participants' scores on the Nationalism Scale are correlated with other MMPI-2 RF scale scores not originally hypothesized in this study. Pearson's correlations coefficient was conducted examining the relationship between scores on the Nationalism Scale and scores on the Aesthetic/Literary Interests scale. The result was significant, $r = .243$, $p < .001$, $N = 805$. Based on the scoring of the Nationalism scale, participants with higher levels of Nationalism have lower levels of aesthetic or literary interests.

Discussion

Prior research has shown that there are similarities between Authoritarianism and Nationalism, such as adherence to conventional values, the belief that those who do not follow those conventional values should be punished, and a respect and desire for an authority figure (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Forbes, 1985). Other characteristics include obedience to authority and a preference for in-group relationships (Shulman & Bloom, 2014; Bonikowski & DiMaggio, 2016). The purpose of this research was to determine whether there was a relationship between scores on a scale measuring Nationalism and assessments of Authoritarianism. Using archival data, I examined 805 participants' scores on a Nationalism Scale and scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form that are related to Authoritarianism. Authoritarians often display aggressive tendencies, showing support for war and more positive attitudes toward violence (Raden, 1981; Benjamin, 2006). They feel anger towards those they perceive to be in the wrong (Saeri, Iyer, and Louis, 2015). Authoritarianism is associated with paranoia or Ideas of Persecution (Koller, 1995; Mirisola, Roccato, Russo, Spagna, and Vieno, 2013). People higher in Authoritarianism are often cynical of the world around them (Pattyn, Van Hiel, Dhont, & Onraet, 2012; Napier & Jost, 2008). I

chose the Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution, and Cynicism scales of the MMPI-2-RF because of their associations with Authoritarianism in order to assess participants' levels of Authoritarianism. My hypothesis was supported, showing a significant correlation between scores on the Nationalism scale and scores on the Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution and Cynicism scales of the MMPI-2RF. As levels of Nationalism increased, so did scores on these four scales. This indicates that there is a relationship between Nationalism and Authoritarianism.

At first, high scores in Nationalism may seem like a positive attribute for a nation's citizens. However, there is a distinct difference between Nationalism and the concept of Patriotism. People who score highly on Nationalism are more likely to not just love their country, but to believe it is superior to all other countries and to strive for domination over other countries. Patriotism, on the other hand, indicates devotion to one's country without the desire to dominate over other countries. These results are relevant in the United States' current political climate. One of the first issues is that people conflate Nationalism and Patriotism, when they are in actuality two separate constructs with different characteristics and implications for different outcomes. Loving one's country is not a problem. However, loving one's country and believing that it should dominate the international conversation can be problematic and could have ramifications for the United States in the future. Some examples of this are the disagreements over tariffs, trade deals, and longstanding international agreements. Finally, because of the association between Nationalism and indicators of Authoritarianism displayed in this article, one could surmise that a more Nationalistic country could be susceptible to embracing an Authoritarian culture. People who were more Nationalist were also more aggressive, anger

prone, cynical, and paranoid, which has the potential to cause problems both nationally and internationally.

Limitations and future research

This study used data that was collected on a college campus. Thus, it may not be representative of society at large. Another limitation of the study is the measure used to assess Authoritarianism. While people who are Authoritarian display Aggression, Anger Proneness, Ideas of Persecution, and Cynicism, it might have been more helpful to have a scale that specifically assesses Authoritarianism as a whole. An example of this would be either Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford's F-scale (1950) or the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 1981). However, as this study used archival data there was not the option of choosing the measures. Future research could examine this association between Nationalism and Authoritarianism more in-depth by using measures specific to Authoritarianism.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). Right wing authoritarianism. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 144(4), 421-447.
- Anderson, C. A., Benjamin, A. J., Wood, P. K., & Bonacci, A. M. (2006). Development and testing of the Velicer attitudes toward violence scale: Evidence for a four-factor model. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(2), 122-136. doi:10.1002/ab.20112
- Ben-Porath, Y. S. & Tellegen, A. (2011). *The MMPI-2-RF: Manual for administration, scoring, and interpretation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Benjamin, A. J. (2006). The relationship between Right-Wing Authoritarianism and attitudes toward violence: further validation of the Attitudes Toward Violence Scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 34(8), 923-926. doi:10.2224/sbp.2006.34.8.923
- Bonikowski, B. & DiMaggio, P. (2016). Varieties of American popular nationalism. *American Sociological Review*, 81(5), 949-980. doi:10.1177/0003122416663683
- Buss, A. H. & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, (62)3, 452-459.
- Evera, S. V. (1994). Hypotheses on nationalism and war. *International Security*, 18(4), 5. doi:10.2307/2539176
- Famer, R. E. (1977). Cynicism: a factor in corrections work. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, (5)3, 237-246.

- Forbes, H. D. (1985). *Nationalism, ethnocentrism, and personality: social science and critical theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- IJzendoorn, M. H. (1989). Moral judgment, authoritarianism, and ethnocentrism. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 129(1), 37-45. doi:10.1080/00224545.1989.9711697
- Kecmanovic, D. (1996). *The mass psychology of ethnonationalism*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Koller, M. (1995). Authoritarianism, projection, and person perception: what do authoritarians infer from another's attempt to rebut a rumor? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(1), 199-212. doi:10.1207/s15324834baspl701&2_11
- Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 10(2), 257. doi:10.2307/3791647
- Laguna, L., Linn, A., Ward, K., & Rupslaukyte, R. (2009). An examination of authoritarian personality traits among police officers: the role of experience. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 25(2), 99-104. doi:10.1007/s11896-009-9060-0
- Mirisola, A., Roccato, M., Russo, S., Spagna, G., & Vieno, A. (2013). Societal threat to safety, compensatory control, and Right-Wing Authoritarianism. *Political Psychology*, 35(6), 795-812. doi:10.1111/pops.12048
- Napier, J. L., & Jost, J. T. (2009). The "Antidemocratic Personality" revisited: a cross-national investigation of working-class Authoritarianism. *Democracy and Disenfranchisement*, 595-617. doi:10.1002/9781444307337.ch9
- Osborne, D., Milojev, P., & Sibley, C. G. (2017). Authoritarianism and national identity: examining the longitudinal effects of SDO and RWA on Nationalism and Patriotism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(8), 1086-1099. doi:10.1177/0146167217704196

- Pattyn, S., Hiel, A. V., Dhont, K., & Onraet, E. (2011). Stripping the political cynic: a psychological exploration of the concept of political cynicism. *European Journal of Personality*, 26(6), 566-579. doi:10.1002/per.858
- Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V. L., & Brown, R. (2009). National identification and anti-immigrant prejudice: Individual and contextual effects of national definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 72(1), 24-38. doi:10.1177/019027250907200104
- Raden, D. (1981). Authoritarianism revisited: evidence for an aggression factor. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 9 (2), 147-153.
- Saeri, A. K., Iyer, A., & Louis, W. R. (2015). Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation predict outsiders' responses to an external group conflict: implications for identification, anger, and collective action. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 15(1), 303-332. doi:10.1111/asap.12081
- Shulman, S., & Bloom, S. (2014). Does nation building increase the strength of citizen loyalty? Theoretical and empirical investigations of Ukrainian nationalism. *Polity*, 46(3), 354-380. doi:10.1057/pol.2014.17
- Smith, A. D. (2005). Nationalism in early modern Europe. *History and Theory*, 44(3), 404-415. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2303.2005.00332.x
- Todosijević, B. (2001). Dimensions of nationalism: Structure of nationalist attitudes in Hungary and Yugoslavia. *Central European Political Science Review*, 2(6), 170-186.
- Van Hiel, A., Mervielde, I., & De Fruyt, F. (2004). The relationship between maladaptive personality and right wing ideology. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(2), 405-417. doi:10.1016/s0191-8869(03)00105-3

Appendix 1

Nationalism Scale

1. It is nonsense that all nations are equal. Some peoples are more, some less honorable.
2. To be without a nation is like to be without family.
3. It is not good to be too open towards other nations.
4. Every nation should live in its own state.
5. Nationally mixed marriages are determined to failure.
6. An important thing children should learn in schools is to love their nation.
7. Feeling of national attachment is one of the most valuable feelings one could ever experience.
8. One should be reserved and cautious toward other nations, even when they appear to be friendly.
9. One should respect his nation and its tradition.
10. All great deeds are inspired by the national feelings.
11. In our country our nation should be privileged regarding the employment.
12. One's most important characteristics come from his nationality.
13. One's destiny equals with the nation's destiny.
14. Renewal of our national ideals is our most important task.
15. Putting our nation above others is nothing evil, it is just an expression of love for our people.
16. One should always put national interests above the personal ones.
17. National majority should always have more political rights than minorities.



Office of Research Integrity
 Institutional Review Board (IRB)
 2000 University Avenue
 Muncie, IN 47306-0155
 Phone: 765-285-5070

DATE: January 29, 2018
 TO: Rose Skelly
 FROM: Ball State University IRB
 RE: IRB protocol # 1168213-1
 TITLE: Correlates of Authoritarianism and Nationalism
 SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project
 ACTION: APPROVED
 DECISION DATE: January 29, 2018
 REVIEW TYPE: EXEMPT

The Institutional Review Board reviewed your protocol on January 29, 2018 and has determined the procedures you have proposed are appropriate for exemption under the federal regulations. As such, there will be no further review of your protocol, and you are cleared to proceed with the procedures outlined in your protocol. As an exempt study, there is no requirement for continuing review. Your protocol will remain on file with the IRB as a matter of record.

Exempt Categories:

	Category 1: Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
	Category 2: Research involving the use of educational test (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior
	Category 3: Research involving the use of educational test (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under category 2, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
XXXXX	Category 4: Research involving the collection of study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

	Category 5: Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under these programs.
	Category 6: Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed which contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Editorial Notes:

1. Secondary analysis of de-identified data.

While your project does not require continuing review, it is the responsibility of the P.I. (and, if applicable, faculty supervisor) to inform the IRB if the procedures presented in this protocol are to be modified or if problems related to human research participants arise in connection with this project. **Any procedural modifications must be evaluated by the IRB before being implemented, as some modifications may change the review status of this project.** Please contact (ORI Staff) if you are unsure whether your proposed modification requires review or have any questions. Proposed modifications should be addressed in writing and submitted electronically to the IRB (<http://www.bsu.edu/irb>) for review. Please reference the above IRB protocol number in any communication to the IRB regarding this project.

Reminder: Even though your study is exempt from the relevant federal regulations of the Common Rule (45 CFR 46, subpart A), you and your research team are not exempt from ethical research practices and should therefore employ all protections for your participants and their data which are appropriate to your project.

D. Clark Dickin, PhD/Chair
Institutional Review Board

Christopher Mangelli, JD, MS, MEd, CIP/
Director
Office of Research Integrity